

Reading: See syllabus

Problems to turn in (read the rest):

1. Refer back to pp. 661-663; the spin susceptibility of a conduction electron gas at $T = 0$ K may be discussed by another method. Let $n_{\pm} \equiv (n/2)(1 \mp \zeta)$ be the concentration of spin-up (-down) electrons, i.e. parallel (antiparallel) to a magnetic field H .

a) Show that, in H , the total energy per volume in the spin-up band in a free-electron gas is

$$E^+ = E_0 (1 - \zeta)^{5/3} + (n/2) \mu_B H (1 - \zeta),$$

where $E_0 = (3/10)n\varepsilon_F$ in terms of the Fermi energy ε_F in zero magnetic field. Find a similar expression for E^- .

b) Minimize the total energy per volume $E^+ + E^-$ with respect to ζ and solve for the equilibrium value of ζ in the approximation $\zeta \ll 1$. Show then that the magnetization $M = (3/2) n\mu_B^2 H/\varepsilon_F$, as in the class discussion of Pauli paramagnetism.

c) We now consider the effect of exchange interactions among the conduction electrons. As a viable first approximation, we assume that electrons with parallel spins interact with each other with energy $-V$ (with $V > 0$), while electrons with antiparallel spins do not interact with each other. Show that the additional term $-(1/8) V n^2 (1 - \zeta)^2$ is added to E^+ and find a similar expression for E^- .

d) Minimize the total energy and solve for ζ again in the limit $\zeta \ll 1$. Show that the magnetization is

$$M = \frac{3n\mu_B^2}{2\varepsilon_F - \frac{3}{2}Vn} H$$

Notice that there is peculiar behavior for $V > 4\varepsilon_F/3n$. One can easily show that at $H=0$ the total energy for the paramagnetic state with $\zeta = 0$ is unstable relative to a ferromagnetic state with finite ζ . This is called the Stoner criterion for ferromagnetism. (adapted from Kittel, ISSP) This kind of phase transition at $T=0$ is now glamorized with the label "quantum phase transition."

2. 28-4.

3. 28-6; there is a typo in eqn. 28.47: the denominator should have a factor of 2.

4. 29-1, parts a, b i and b ii; read the rest.

Maybe another problem.

Read 15-3. Since I derive this result in undergraduate modern physics courses, I presume you have already seen it. Read also 15-5, which I might have assigned had time permitted. To help visualize why γ is negative, you should look at Fig. 9.13.